PLANNING CRITERIA

This section includes the policy framework used to prepare the Proposed CE Network. It contains four items:

- Mapping criteria, which were endorsed by the Steering Committee
- Draft Goals and Policies for circulation prepared by the Steering Committee and Interest Group Committee
- LOS E/F criteria, which were developed by DPW and DPLU staff as guidelines for accepting a lower level of service where road improvements faced significant constraints.
- Non-Programmed Caltrans Roads where staff has made recommendations for state roadway improvements that are not part of the current SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan.

MAPPING CRITERIA

	Objective	**Evaluation Criteria**
Road Capacity	Provide a CE Road Network with adequate capacity to support land uses proposed for GP2020.	At build-out of GP2020, CE road network operates at: LOS D or better.[1]
Maximize Traffic Movement	The road network should enhance connectivity by creating multiple connections between communities and between different areas within each community.	• Road network minimizes traffic volumes on a single roadway and provides alternate routes of travel • Multiple routes for ingress and egress provide sufficient accessibility in the event of a fire. • Traffic volumes are dispersed along multiple roads. • Dead-end CE roads are avoided.

[1] Exceptions: County staff may recommend accepting LOS E or F on certain roadway segments rather than modifying the road network. Justifications could include avoiding significant environmental impacts and town center development or preservation.

	Objective	Evaluation Criteria
Community Consensus	CE road network should be benefit region-wide interests while incorporating community preferences, whenever possible, into the region-wide network.	• Road network considers requirements beyond the local community to accommodate through trips. • Planning groups are involved in a public process for road network planning that incorporates community preferences.
Minimize Costs	Minimize new road construction and road right-of-way acquisition costs.	• Avoid developed areas with high land costs, high environmental mitigation costs, and/or high relocation costs when alternative routes are available. • Avoid floodplains, steep slopes, and other areas with high costs for road construction and/or environmental mitigation. • Remove roads from the CE network when they are not needed to support forecast traffic volumes, emergency fire access, or the completion of a connected network of CE roads.
Minimize Environmental Impacts	Minimize impacts to natural and biological resources and scenic areas. Whenever possible, avoid areas with steep slopes.	Road alignments should: • Avoid natural and biological resources • Minimize impacts to scenic viewsheds • Conform to the topography of the site.
Select appropriate road types for surrounding land use.	CE roads within town or village centers should contribute to the economic and social development of the community.	In commercial and higher density residential areas, CE road types or alignments should accommodate pedestrian movement, bicycle paths, and parking spaces within the right of way. If appropriate, modify road types to accommodate non-vehicular traffic.
	Incorporate multi-modal transportation options into the circulation network, especially in town centers and other urbanized areas.	Multi-modal transportation types are incorporated, when appropriate, into planned CE roads: transit, bicycles, joggers and pedestrians, and (in certain communities) equestrian.

	Objective	**Evaluation Criteria**
Support Land Use Goals	Provide roads and parkways that reinforce the positive aspects of the community's character and are appropriate for different areas within a community.	Roadway selections, especially parkway configurations, should reflect community type and regional land use category (village, semi-rural, rural lands).
	Avoid locating CE roads *within* town centers and residential neighborhoods.	CE roads are located at the periphery of town centers and residential neighborhoods. If existing CE roads are located within town centers and residential neighborhoods, then road types should minimize conflicts between regional traffic and other types of circulation (local roads, pedestrian walkways, bikeways, etc.).
	Minimize impacts to local road network caused by freeways or expressways that carry regional traffic.	Regional high-volume roads should be located at the periphery of communities. When necessary, use grade separated interchanges to retain connections in the local road network.
	Connect existing and planned retail or employment centers and residential communities.	Roads provide direct access between village cores/town centers, major commercial or industrial districts and residential neighborhoods.
Regional Trails and Regional Bikeways	Facilitate long-range connectivity of the approved regional trail network.	Road types should include approved regional trail and bikeway networks within the road right-of-way for CE roads.

DRAFT GOALS AND POLICIES

	Steering Committee	Interest Group Committee
Circulation Goal I	Safe, convenient, efficient, and accessible multi-modal circulation systems.	A multi-modal circulation system that provides for the safe, accessible convenient and efficient movement of people and goods.
Policies A	Establish road standards for different community types: urban, suburban and rural.	Establish transportation network standards that are appropriate for different community types: urban, suburban and rural.
B	Ensure and maintain a road network for safe, efficient movement of people and goods.	Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for roads.
C	Establish design guidelines for safe multi-use roadways.	Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for public transportation.
D	Establish a County trails system.	Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for a County trails system.
E	Establish additional nodes and opportunities for public transportation where higher densities exist or are planned for in the land use element.	Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for multi-use.
Additional Draft Policies:		
1	Ensure provision of adequate local circulation system capacity in response to planned growth.	Ensure timely provision of adequate local circulation system capacity in response to planned growth.
2	*Delete* because it is duplicative of Policy C and Policy E.	Establish land use and transportation network patterns that will help reduce single-occupant automobile trips, encourage the use of public transit and alternative modes of travel, and encourage pedestrian-oriented development.
3	Coordinate the location and design of the circulation system to serve existing and new employment centers, residential communities, and historic and scenic areas.	Coordinate the location and design of the circulation system to serve existing and new employment centers and residential communities.

	Steering Committee	Interest Group Committee
4	Locate and design the circulation system to minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods, environmentally sensitive areas and scenic areas.	Locate and design the circulation system to minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods, environmentally sensitive areas and scenic areas.
5	*Delete* because it is outside of GP2020 purview.	Site and design schools to allow and encourage students to walk and bicycle to school safely.
6	*Delete* because it is duplicative of Policy C and Policy E.	Establish multi-modal public transit centers in existing and planned higher density areas.
7	*Delete* because it is duplicative of New Policy #2.	Support and encourage the use of public transit and car/van pools to reduce roadway congestion, conserve energy and reduce pollution.
8	*Delete* because it is duplicative of Policy C.	Provide safe and attractive accommodation for all users of the roadway, including transit riders, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
9	*Delete* because it is duplicative of Policy E.	Establish transit-oriented development guidelines and incentives.
10	*Delete* because it is duplicative of Policy D.	Establish a Country trails system.

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTING LOS E/F

State law requires jurisdictions to develop a circulation network that accommodates the land uses proposed in the General Plan. Therefore, a lower Level of Service (LOS) should be accepted only in special circumstances. The standard adopted by the Board of Supervisors for the LOS on Circulation Element (CE) roads is LOS D. The draft GP2020 circulation map does provide a network where approximately 90% of all County roads *will* meet the established standard. This document identifies draft criteria to be used at the General Plan level to determine the circumstances when LOS E or F may be accepted for CE roads.

These criteria have a limited application and were developed to address regional issues and existing conditions encountered in a comprehensive general plan update. To mitigate the acceptance of a failing LOS, staff proposes that future development pressure be closely monitored. Unplanned future development should not add pressure to a road where a failing service level has been accepted. Moreover, the criteria are only intended for use by this general plan update. In addition, staff recommends that roads with LOS E and F be reviewed within 5 to 10 years using updated data and traffic models.

General Plan 2020 is tasked with planning for growth while preserving the County's environmental, cultural, and historical resources. The recommended road network is based on realistic expectations and provides predictability for future development. It seeks to balance benefits of an acceptable level of service with constraints that limit the County's ability to provide improvements. In some cases**,** the constraints are so substantial that they render future road construction infeasible or highly impractical. To address such cases, staff consulted with County Counsel and recommends that LOS E/F criteria be established to define the conditions where a failing level of service is acceptable in this general plan update.

Substantial Constraints Affecting Road Construction

Construction Costs

The presence of steep topography, floodplains, or existing land development significantly increases the cost to widen or build a road. Extensive grading, engineering structures, or substantial right-of-way acquisitions may render improvements cost prohibitive. When the benefits of providing a road with an acceptable level of service are limited and do not justify the construction costs, a failing service level may be acceptable, especially when the projected traffic volume is only slightly over the LOS D threshold.

Environmental Impacts

Construction of some roads would significantly impact important habitats, destroy archaeological sites, impact waterways, or require the demolition of historic landmarks. The preservation of valuable resources may outweigh the benefits of road improvements, and the effort to avoid or mitigate undesired impacts has a major effect on construction costs.

Established Land Development

Existing businesses, historic buildings, established neighborhoods and a pedestrian-friendly environment are essential components of a healthy town center. Road improvements that negatively affect these components can be undesirable. Wider roads may divide a town and change its character. Costs to widen a road are substantially increased by the acquisition of right-of-way and the relocation of existing land uses. If costly construction or widening of roads substantially disrupts the vitality of a town center, a lower level of service may be preferable.

Criteria

Town Centers

Town Centers further a number of project objectives such as improving housing affordability, accommodating growth and helping to define the character of a community. Therefore, a failing level of service may be accepted when widening the road would obstruct pedestrian movements, impede the economic vitality of existing/planned businesses, require the demolition of historic structures, or negatively alter the overall character of the area.

Marginal Deficiencies

Acceptance of a lower level of service may be the more preferable choice when the road failure results from only a marginal deficiency in performance. Traffic congestion on a small portion of a road may produce a failing level of service for only that short segment while the remainder of the road is acceptable. Due to the short segment length, overall delays may be small in comparison to the travel time along the length of the entire road corridor. In many cases, operational improvements such as synchronized signals and additional turn lanes can alleviate the problem and are more cost effective than adding unnecessary travel lanes.

Some failing roads are projected to carry a traffic volume that is not significantly higher than the acceptable threshold (LOS D). If the projected volume is not anticipated to affect overall traffic operation, planning for a wider road to accommodate the additional traffic may not be required. Acceptance of a lower level of service is particularly appropriate when underutilized, alternate routes are available.

Environmental Constraints

Major physical and environmental constraints severely hinder construction of needed improvements for some failing roads. GP2020 CE policies seek to minimize environmental impacts and minimize road construction costs. In addition, the planned road network should be consistent with the County's Multiple Species Conservation Plan. The nature of the constraints, the impact of needed improvements, potential effects on sensitive habitat/species, the availability of alternate routes, the cost of construction and the need for better traffic circulation are carefully considered by staff before making a recommendation to accept a failing LOS.

Interregional Traffic

All local jurisdictions must handle traffic from areas outside their authority. However the volume generated from substantial growth in Riverside County is projected to significantly exceed the state facilities that are currently planned to service this demand. Excessive interregional traffic overflows onto County roads that are not intended or designed to service this traffic. Similar

circumstances exist on County roads that serve tribal gaming. For these roads, necessary improvements to achieve an acceptable level of service are beyond the County's ability to accommodate the interregional demand.

Table 3: Types OF LOS E/F Roads

	Proposed Criteria	Recommended Mitigations
Town Centers		
Constraints *Construction Costs* *Established Land Development*	Within established or planned town center Consistent with community preferences and community is willing to accept a lower LOS Traffic volume does not significantly exceed acceptable level of service threshold Improvements would require removing a significant number of existing businesses or residences	Plan and build bypass roads when feasible Provide alternate routes for local residents. Utilize couplets to improve traffic flow. Make operational improvements Modify land use where feasible
Interregional Traffic		
Constraints *Construction Costs* *Environmental Impacts* *Established Land Development*	Connects major interregional corridors Provides alternate routes to interregional corridors that have failing level of service Improvements to increase capacity attract additional overflow traffic from interregional corridors and still produce failing level of service Improvements would have substantial impacts on environmental resources	Lobby for region-wide solutions to housing and traffic problems Lobby to widen regional arterials, especially I-15 Retain wider ROW along routes that parallel I-15 and widen if needed to minimize impacts to local roads

	Proposed Criteria	Recommended Mitigations
Marginal Deficiencies		
Constraints: *Construction Costs* *Environmental Impacts* *Established Land Development*	Only a short segment of the road fails Projected traffic volume does not significantly exceed the threshold for an acceptable level of service Underutilized, alternate routes exist	Require operational improvements for development projects in the affected area. Monitor traffic every 5-10 years. If traffic levels exceed forecasts then reclassify road if needed. Where appropriate, reclassify 2-lane roads to retain a wider ROW Coordinate with Caltrans to fund and implement operational improvements
Environmental Constraints		
Constraints: *Construction Costs* *Environmental Impacts*	Proposed alignment or widening would impact significant Tier I habitat, MSCP preserves, historic landmarks, wetlands, or significant archaeological sites Located in area with steep slopes that would require excessive grading Improvements would substantially impact major public facilities (reservoirs, power lines, etc.)	Modify land uses where feasible Plan alternate routes where feasible Select road classification that maximize the road capacity within the ROW Make operational improvements

NON-PROGRAMMED CALTRANS ROADS

The GP2020 traffic model includes improvements to State facilities that are part of the SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan's (RTP) reasonably expected scenario for 2030. However, traffic forecast models showed that in some locations the planned improvements did not fully accommodate projected traffic volumes.

Riverside County Forecasts

The problem was particularly noticeable on I-15 from the Riverside County border to State Route 78, where large volumes of traffic from Riverside County caused freeway traffic to overflow onto alternate route, such as Old Highway 295 or other County roads. Often the alternate routes were not intended or designed to serve interregional traffic. As a result, these roads did not meet the level of service target for GP2020.

In order to minimize the impact of inter-regional traffic on County roads and on some State highways, SANDAG conducted the next phase of traffic models using an increased capacity (four additional lanes) on I-15. Increasing road capacity on I-15, the primary north/south freeway carrying commuter trips to regional job centers, did reduce traffic pressure on surrounding roads and allowed the County to propose improvements to County facilities that were feasible. Cost estimates for additional lanes on I-15 are summarized in Attachment H.

Other Non-Programmed Road Improvements

State highways were identified as needing road improvements in several locations that go beyond the current SANDAG RTP. Those facilities include SR-94 in Valle de Oro, SR-76 in Bonsall, and SR-67 in Lakeside. In Lakeside, for example, State Route 67 is programmed for improvement to a four-lane conventional highway in the current RTP. Expanding State Route 67 to four lanes did not address the forecast traffic congestion, however, and staff determined that this State facility should be retained as a freeway as currently mapped in the Existing General Plan. In addition, staff slightly extended the freeway boundary, which assumes grade-separated overpasses, and also reclassified SR-67 as a conventional six-lane Prime Arterial in other areas to accommodate forecast traffic within the Lakeside community.

In most cases, the Proposed Road Network includes road improvements to State highways needed to maintain LOS D or better, which is the target service level for GP2020. The recommended CE road network therefore provides guidance to County staff, to State agencies, and to other jurisdictions within the San Diego region who participate in the SANDAG RTP process. For a cost estimate of other non-programmed road improvements, please see Attachment H.